

1	oppose violated a local rule. See Henry v. Gill Indus., 983 F.2d 943, 950 (9th Cir. 1993).
2	Rather, the moving party must demonstrate the absence of genuine issues of material fact,
3	regardless of whether the party against whom the motion for summary judgment is
4	directed has filed any opposition. See Cristobal v. Siegel, 26 F.3d 1488, 1491 (9th Cir.
5	1994).
6	Here, the University of Washington filed a motion for summary judgment in
7	which it demonstrates a factual record of compliance with the Americans with
8	Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act as applied to Chester as well as showing the
9	absence of genuine issues of material fact. Chester has failed to file any opposition.
10	Accordingly, the Court concludes that the University of Washington's motion for
11	summary judgment should be granted.
12	The Court, having considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion and the
13	remainder of the file, does hereby find and ORDER that the University of Washington's
14	motion for summary judgment (Dkt. 55) is GRANTED and the claims alleged in the
15	Plaintiff's complaint against the University of Washington are DISMISSED with
16	prejudice.
17	Dated this 6 th day of November, 2012.
18	6 10
19	Dey \ Settle
20	BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge
21	æ
22	